



Attorney's Docket No.: 28955.4025

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Hisayuki KAWAMURA, et al. Art Unit : 1626
Serial No. : 10/532,140 Examiner : Joseph R. Kosack
Filing Date: April 20, 2005
Title : AROMATIC AMINE DERIVATIVE AND ORGANIC
ELECTROLUMINESCENT ELEMENT EMPLOYING THE
SAME

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
Customer Service Window
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Randolph Building
401 Dulany St.
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

In response to the alleged lack of unity of invention under PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2, and the Restriction Requirement stated in the Office Action mailed May 8, 2006, applicants hereby provisionally elect, with traverse, to prosecute the subject matter of Group IV (claims 1-2 (in part)) in this application. Applicants note and appreciate the statement in the Office Action that method of preparation claims, to the extent commensurate in scope with the elected invention, will be examined with the elected invention.

However, applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement since the subject matter of all of claims 1-6 is sufficiently related that a thorough and complete search for the subject matter of the elected claims would necessarily encompass a thorough and complete search for the subject matter of the non-elected claims. See, for example, U.S. Patent 6,344,283 (cover sheet and claims attached). Thus, search and examination of the entire application could

Applicant : Hisayuki KAWAMURA, *et al.*
Serial No. : 10/532,140
Filed : April 20, 2005
Page : 2 of 2

be made without serious burden. See MPEP § 803 in which states that "[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits." This policy should apply in the present application to avoid unnecessary delay and expense to applicants and duplicative examination by the Patent Office.

Applicants' undersigned attorney received a non-substantive voice mail message left by the Examiner on April 25, 2006, and telephoned the Examiner and left a voice mail message on April 26, 2006, but never received any return communication before receipt of the May 8, 2005 Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP


Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177

June 8, 2006
Date

RWP/lmw

Attorney Docket No.: 28955.4025

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795
Telephone: (202) 429-3000